

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RONALD A. GADSDEN,

Defendant and Appellant.

D044421

(Super. Ct. No. SCD178424)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Bernard E. Revak, Judge. Affirmed.

Ronald A. Gadsden entered a negotiated guilty plea to assault with a deadly weapon. (Pen. Code, § 245, subd. (a)(1).) The court suspended imposition of sentence and placed him on five years' probation including conditions he serve 270 days in custody, participate in psychological counseling, and pay \$79,000 victim restitution, subject to modification. The court denied a certificate of probable cause. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 30(b).)

DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief setting forth the evidence in the superior court. Counsel presents no argument for reversal but asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel refers to as possible but not arguable issues: (1) whether Gadsden's guilty plea was constitutionally valid; (2) whether Gadsden's trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to object to the amount of restitution; and (3) whether psychological counseling was reasonably related to the charges.¹

We granted Gadsden permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded. A review of the entire record pursuant to *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, including the possible issues referred to pursuant to *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issue. Competent counsel has represented Gadsden on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

¹ Because Gadsden entered a guilty plea, he cannot challenge the facts underlying the conviction. (Pen. Code, § 1237.5; *People v. Martin* (1973) 9 Cal.3d 687, 693.) We need not recite the facts.

HUFFMAN, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

O'ROURKE, J.

AARON, J.